

- Q.B. Concl'd
- (a) means for supporting the mirror lens; and
  - (b) means for mounting the mirror lens to a mounting surface.

Cancel Claim 1 without prejudice.

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment Claims 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12 remain in the application.

At the outset, Applicants' attorney wished to thank the Examiner for the courtesies which were extended during the interview conducted on March 18, 1996.

Based upon the extensive discussion held between the undersigned and the Examiner at that interview the present Supplemental Amendment is submitted.

It is respectfully submitted that when the present amendment is considered in the light of the previous amendment, and in view of the arguments made during the course of interview that the claims, as amended herein, have been rendered patentably distinct from the art of record.

As discussed during the time of the interview, it is submitted that the art which is being applied herein simply does not teach, disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in the now amended claims.

To this end, it is to be noted that Claim 1 has been cancelled herefrom and replaced with new Claim 11. Claim 11 now

defines a mirror assembly comprising a mirror lens having an oval perimetral edge and a lens body which is a convex ellipsoid. The claim now further requires that the lens body have a major axis and a minor axis wherein the major axis has a varying radius of curvature from the point of intersection of the axes to the perimetral edge, and wherein the radius of curvature decreases from the point of intersection of the axes to the perimetral edge. What this means is that the greatest curvature of the mirror is at the oval perimetral edge.

This invention is neither taught, disclosed nor suggested by the references which the Examiner has applied herein, i.e. Albers, U.S. Patent No. 5,084,785 and Schmidt, U.S. Patent No. 4,436,372.

Dealing first with the Albers reference, and as pointed out to the Examiner during the course of the interview, the Albers reference is totally inapposite with the teaching hereof. Albers teaches that:

"The reflective surface 16 by reason of its aspheric elliptic paraboloid form is one which has a surface the curvature of which continuously changes from point to point on that surface with the sharpest curvature at 20 and decreasing curvature 20 to edge 18." At column 3, line 35 et seq.

What this means is that the smallest radius of curvature is at the point 20 and the largest radius of curvature

is at the edge 18. In other words, maximum curvature means shortest radius of curvature and vice versa. This is the opposite of the present invention. Also, Albers teaches an aspheric mirror. An aspheric mirror, by definition, and as shown in the drawings of the Albers reference, is not an oval mirror. There is a medial rectangular section in the Albers mirror. The present mirror is spheric, i.e. an oval. The claims now clearly denote this.

Therefore, it is submitted that in all respects the present invention is wholly unlike that disclosed and claimed by Albers.

With respect to the Schmidt reference, this reference is in no manner suggestive of the present invention.

Schmidt teaches, at column 2 thereof, that the outer peripheral surface has an outer diameter D. This indicates that this is a circular mirror - not an oval mirror. Furthermore, the reference discloses that the elliptical surface has a minor axis at 3.72" from the origin and a major axis at 4.11" from the origin with a truncation at 0.72" from the origin. This necessarily implies that the elliptical surface does not have a continuing varying radius of curvature.

Therefore, it is submitted that in all respects the art being applied herein does not teach, disclose or suggest the invention, as set forth in the now amended claims.

It is respectfully submitted that when the present amendment is construed in the light of the previous amendment

that it becomes apparent that the instant invention as set forth in the amended claims is patentably distinct over the art of record.

If the Examiner feels that the prosecution of this application can be expedited then he is courteously requested to place a telephone call to Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

WEINTRAUB, DuROSS & BRADY



Arnold S. Weintraub  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 25523  
(810) 258-5590

WEINTRAUB, DuROSS & BRADY  
30200 Telegraph Road, Suite 444  
Bingham Farms, MI 48025

ASW:tab

Dated: March 22, 1996